DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 231 SP 034 394

AUTHOR Epps, M. Virginia; Ganser, Tom
TITLE Providing an Urban Field Experience for Students Attending a Rural Teacher Preparation Institution.
PUB DATE Feb 93
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (73rd, Los Angeles, CA, February 13-17, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Design; Racial Differences; Rural Environment; *Rural Urban Differences; Special Education; *Teaching Experience; *Urban Teaching
IDENTIFIERS Diversity (Student); Milwaukee Public Schools WI; University of Wisconsin Whitewater

ABSTRACT

This paper provides a sketch of a preservice teacher education field experience in schools serving ethnically and racially diverse populations. Since the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater is situated in a rural setting with a predominantly white population, accessing schools serving ethnically and racially diverse populations poses significant problems. Through collaboration with the racially and ethnically diverse Milwaukee Public Schools, 684 students have been placed in urban classrooms. This field experience is one part of a 9-hour pre-professional block taken by students desiring entry into a professional education program. The sketch of this collaborative program includes information on the program's purposes, structure, demographics, logistics, results, problems, and approaches to problem solving. Appendices contain teacher education program approval rules and appeal procedure, pre-professional block field observation and participation experience data, and a cooperating teacher evaluation form. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED355231

PROVIDING AN URBAN FIELD EXPERIENCE FOR STUDENTS ATTENDING A RURAL TEACHER PREPARATION INSTITUTION

M. Virginia Epps
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Tom Ganser
Associate Director of Field Experiences
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Ganser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Los Angeles, California, Feb. 13-17, 1992.

SP034394

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROVIDING AN URBAN FIELD EXPERIENCE FOR STUDENTS ATTENDING A RURAL TEACHER PREPARATION INSTITUTION

M. Virginia Epps
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Tom Ganser
Associate Director of Field Experiences
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to provide a sketch of a field experience in school sites serving ethnically and racially diverse populations which precedes a two year teacher preparation program. Since the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater is situated in a rural setting with a dominantly white population, accessing schools serving ethnically and racially diverse populations poses significant problems. Milwaukee, WI, which has a large school district serving an intensely diverse population is approximately one hour from Whitewater. Through extended collaborative efforts with the Milwaukee Public Schools, each of 684 university students have been placed in Milwaukee schools for over 50 hours during the last three semesters.

This field experience is one part of a nine hour *Pre-Professional Block* taken by students desiring entry into a Professional Education Program that generally requires two years for completion. The students in the block take three classes on Tuesdays and Thursdays for nine hours of credit. The block is composed of the following courses: Educational Psychology or Child Development, Education in a Pluralistic Society, and Observation and Participation (O&P). The latter course is the enrollment for the Milwaukee field experience.

The sketch of this collaborative program is divided the following sections related to the program: 1. Purposes, 2. Structure, 3. Demographics, 4. Logistics, 5. Results, 6. Problems, and 7. Possible Approaches to Solving Identified Problems. Since the intent of this paper is to introduce the program rather than to present on-going research related to the program effectiveness, the results section is treated with broad strokes rather than careful, analytical reasoning sequences.

1. Purposes

Like many timely ideas, the nudge for implementation of this field experience program was a bureaucratic mandate. This field program fulfills two Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction requirements. The state regulations require that all individuals in teacher preparation programs complete 100 hours (200 hours for special education students) of K-12 classroom field experience before entering their clinical or student teaching semester (Appendix A, PI 4.10). Fifty of these hours must be in school settings serving ethnically and racially diverse student populations (Appendix A, PI 4.11). This second stipulation drives the choice of Milwaukee Public Schools for the O&P field sites.

Thus, the explicit purpose of the O&P program in Milwaukee is to fulfill the state mandate; however, an implicit purpose of the program is also being fulfilled. By challenging many of the preservice teacher education students' stereotypes associated with diverse student populations and

urban schools, more teachers may be interested in and become prepared for employment by urban school districts.

A number of explicit curricular purposes are being addressed through this field component of the Pre-Professional Block. Since this program is the first time that the students have been in a K-12 classroom in which they are not the target audience, they have a good opportunity to methodically study the dynamics and processes going on in the classroom. To facilitate this study, part of the O&P sessions are devoted to developing systematic observation skills using a variety of accepted data collection tools such as scripting, anecdotal records, classroom mapping, frequency counts, and event systems.

By not having the primary responsibility for structuring the classroom, the university students also have an opportunity to focus on recognizing connections among their Educational Psychology or Child Development and Education in a Pluralistic Society courses and the events and interactions occurring on their field sites. Since the university students are in a position where they can take a somewhat detached perspective, they may begin to formulate concepts of within school cultures as well as the community cultures entering the schools and their effects on classroom dynamics and learning. The experiences in the field encourage the students to question the assumptions under-lying what is being learned as well as how it is being learned.

Two obvious curricular purposes of any field experience include career exploration and facilitation of the transition from being a member of the target student audience to being a teacher. Because this program provides the first field experience for the university students, probably the concern with the career exploration purpose is greater than the concern with the student-to-teacher transition purpose. It is important to remember that the career exploration issue in this case is more than just teaching versus non-teaching; it includes the confounding variables of the ethnic and racial diversity of the students in the teaching setting and the socioeconomic setting of the schools in which one might see oneself teaching.

2. Structure

For the first five weeks of the semester, the students attend the Education in a Pluralistic Society and the Educational Psychology or Child Development classes on campus both Tuesday and Thursday. Beginning with the sixth week of classes, the students go to Milwaukee on Tuesday and the campus classes meet only Thursday. The campus portion of O&P, 1.25 hours per week, meets on Thursdays all semester.

These O&P sessions include both large group presentations and small discussion groups. The presentations in the large group meetings of O&P include the following sessions:

1. Program orientation
2. Organization and structure of Milwaukee Public Schools
3. The O&P student in the Milwaukee Public Schools: A principal's perspective and former O&P students' perspectives
4. Two sessions on systematic observation procedures and analysis

The first meeting of the small discussion groups precedes the first Tuesday in Milwaukee. During this meeting the students meet their supervisor who orients them to their particular field site, pro-

cedures to be followed at their field site, and supervisor expectations. Subsequent small group discussions are devoted to processing the culture shock, cultivating a reflective perspective on the field experience, and processing, analyzing, and interpreting data from systematic observations prepared in the field.

Two models for O&P run concurrently, the standard model and an experimental model, Project STREAM. In the standard model, a university student is assigned to shadow one teacher for the entire school day for each of eight days. In the Project STREAM model, a university student shadows a carefully screened Milwaukee Public Schools middle school student for the entire school day. Thus, in Project STREAM, the university student experiences a middle school student's rotation through a set of teachers, while in the standard model, the university student experiences a rotation of classes taught by a single teacher, or, at the elementary level, a series of disciplines taught by one teacher to a single class. In a few cases, students in the standard model have had two teachers and Project STREAM students have had two middle school student partners. Whenever possible, regular education students are assigned to teachers in their major fields of study, e.g., math majors with math teachers.

Two other structural differences distinguish the Project STREAM from the standard O&P model. First, the Project STREAM model also includes two days when the university students host their middle school student partners on the university campus. Second, the Project STREAM university students are enrolled as a single cohort for O&P, Educational Psychology, and Education in a Pluralistic Society, while the students in the standard model are randomly assigned to these three Pre-Professional Block classes.

3. Demographics

The majority of the university students go through considerable culture shock because the bulk of the students come from a farming, working, or middle class background, frequently from rural small town settings. The vast majority of our university students are white and represent a variety of European ethnic groups. Frequently these students represent the first generation in their families to seek four year degrees.

The student ages range from 19 through 45-49 years old; however, the largest block of students falls in the 20-24 years old category. Approximately 66% of the group is female with a large number declaring an interest in some type of elementary certification. Not surprisingly, the majority of the males are at the secondary level where they represent approximately 72% of the group.

This pre-service teacher population picture is strongly traditional. For the most part, student perspectives are conservative, unquestioned, and accepted as given fact. The idea that their way of seeing, doing, or knowing the world is not *the* way things or ideas are seen, done, or known is a jolt. Many of the students grow at least to tolerate more ambiguity if not to be relatively comfortable with it.

4. Logistics

Three factors enter into the selection of school sites in Milwaukee. First, and most important, school sites are selected on the basis of their potential to keep the culture shock at a level that the educative value for the university students would be maximized. No clean, clear cut set of attributes exists for assessing a given school's potential, but the schools selected tend to be in neighborhoods composed of a mixture of single living unit residences and multiple living unit rental properties, some of which are "projects." Large proportions of the students attending the

schools are bussed in from central city locations. Thus, the diversity of the school population frequently is not parallelled by neighborhood diversity and the students have little attachment to the community beyond the school property limits. One principal describes her bussed-in students as their school's "extended neighborhood." In this case, the principal regularly has her teachers bussed to the extended neighborhood for parent conference days.

The second and third factors considered in the selections of school sites are more mundane than the first factor. These factors are the ease of transportation access and variations in school schedules. The earliest schools begin at 7:30 A. M. and extend to 2:38 P.M., while others have a variety of schedules in between these early schools and the latest schools which have hours extending from 9:00 A. M. and 3:38 P. M. The person in charge of the transportation logistics must match the number of university students with the capacity of the vehicle with the school schedules that the vehicle is going to service. If students going to an early school are put on the vehicle going to a nearby late school, then the students at the late schedule school arrive too early and wait at the school before the school personnel are ready for them. Similarly, in the evening, the students from the early school must wait an extended--the students say exasperating--amount of time for the students from the late school.

The university requires the students to use one of the following types of transportation for this program: 1. charter busses, 2. university vans driven by van certified students enrolled in O&P, and 3. private vehicles for students with mobility impairments. The dominant reasons for this requirement are the university liability and courtesy to the Milwaukee schools. Most of these schools have restricted parking near the schools and the possibility of adding up to twenty more cars would not be received with enthusiasm. Also, by driving a single vehicle to each school, all the students arrive at the same time, sign-in at the same time, and are available to receive announcements from the field site building representative at the same time.

The university uses some combination of five to seven vans and four half or full size busses in this program (Appendix B). The students are charged a $60 transportation fee. During the first year of operation, the actual cost per student was $52.96; however, some of the adjustments that have been made in the transportation policies during the current term as well as rising equipment costs will push this per student cost figure higher for the second year.

Beyond the concern for the mechanics of transporting the university students to their field sites lies a strong commitment to fostering a collegial, collaborative spirit in the overall program. With this commitment in mind, university personnel, especially the on-site supervisors, write both introductory and thank you letters to each teacher and building learning coordinator and administrator and provide them with a copy of the *Pre-Clinical Program Handbook*. (Copies available upon request.). Supervisors visit each of their assigned school sites every Tuesday informally contacting as many of their students and their cooperating teachers as possible. Generally the supervisors also check with the principal or learning coordinator each week to identify potential problems. While supervisors' styles vary, they all appreciate their public relations role. At the close of each term, the Field Experiences Office holds a reception for all Milwaukee Public Schools personnel participating in the O&P program.

During the second semester of the program, a supervisor worked collaboratively with the learning coordinator and the staff of one middle school in the preparation of an evaluation form that might be appropriate for the teachers to use in their evaluation of the university students' performance during the field experience. O&P students also reviewed and made suggestions for

the evaluation form. A slightly revised edition of this form is to be used in the schools during the current semester (Appendix C). Teachers at the high school level will be involved in the continuing process of developing an appropriate O&P evaluation form.

When making plans for adjustments in the O&P program that may impact the cooperating teachers' load, university personnel consult with the Milwaukee Teachers' Education Association. In like manner, university personnel consult with district administrators on issues or desired adjustments in the O&P program that may have an impact on the operations or curricular interests of the field site schools.

Probably the two most vital links in fostering and maintaining a collaborative working relationship between the university and the Milwaukee Public Schools are the incorporation of public school personnel in the initial orientation of the O&P students and as members of the Advisory Board. The Advisory Board meets one to two times per semester. It's primary purpose is to monitor the evolution of the program, identify problems and strengths in the program, and to suggest possible solutions to these problems.

At the suggestion of last year's Advisory Board members, the university established an 800 number. The field site schools may use this number to call the university and report late vans or busses, emergency situations with university students, and requests for supervisor contact. Underscoring the university's desire to maintain communication with the schools, principals, building contact persons, and participating teachers are encouraged to use the number when they have any concerns about the field program or the university students placed assigned to their schools.

The six to seven university faculty and staff members who have been scheduled for O&P supervision each semester represent considerable commitment from the three departments providing staff for the program. The Curriculum and Instruction Department provides four to five supervisors, the Educational Foundations Department provides one supervisor, and the Special Education Department provides one supervisor each semester. In an effort to make the program work, department chairpersons have cooperated in scheduling O&P supervisors for full days off campus on each of the eight Tuesdays the students go to Milwaukee.

5. Results

At the present time, results have been collected from two types of surveys. One of the surveys is a thirty item Lickert scale retrospective pretest/posttest format while the other is a simple inquiry into the students' expectations of how important the program would be for them and what sources gave them information about the program. In the spring semester, 1993, 77% of the class indicated that the bulk of their information about the program came from student-to-student communications. Relatively few, 5.9%, indicated that they had no previous information about the program.

When considering student expectations of program importance on a 1 to 10 scale with 10 high, the over all mean rating was 8.68. Female students tended to be slightly more variable than male students, yet the female students had a slightly higher mean than did the male students. The special education students tended to have the lowest variability and the highest expectations. In contrast, secondary students tended to show the greatest variability and the lowest expectations of any of the groups.

Results from the retrospective pretest/posttest survey of the fall, 1992, students are consistent with these expectations pictures. Over all, the means for the composite group from the fall

semester showed a significant change in the desired direction for the total survey mean. Some preliminary analyses of the data from a few subgroups support the following observations:

1. Both female and male students seeking elementary or elementary/middle level certification showed a significant attitude change in the desired direction.

2. Female students seeking secondary certification showed a significant attitude change, while their male counterparts did not. Most of the secondary students in the standard or regular O&P structure were assigned to senior high school field sites, not middle schools; these students did not show significant attitude change as assessed by this closed item survey. In contrast, the students seeking secondary certification who participated in the Project STREAM model did show significant attitude change. It must be remembered, however, that these students were assigned to middle school field sites, not senior high schools.

3. The special education students tended to have the lowest (desired) pretest and posttest means.

4. Two of the Special Education groups, Early Childhood Exceptional Educational Needs and the Secondary Special Education showed a ceiling effect driven absence of significant change.

5. The Elementary Special Education group showed a significant attitude change in the desired direction.

One of the more interesting results on the retrospective pretest/posttest format survey was from the personal safety subscale. The female students had a higher, i.e., more fearful, mean on the pretest than did the males but showed a much lower mean on the posttest than did the males. In other words, the females showed much greater positive change in their sense of personal safety than did the males during the field experience.

When considering these preliminary results, the absence of attitude change among the students assigned to senior high schools is a focus of concern. Certainly questions about the personal and academic characteristics of the students electing secondary certification deserves investigation, but the types of experiences these students have in senior high school field sites must also be questioned. Are these students somehow less malleable that other preservice teachers or is the environment in the senior high school such that stereotypes are reinforced rather than challenged? Are the students too close to their own senior high school years to step apart from it and view it from a metacognitive perspective? Possibly the changes occurring within the preservice teacher education students assigned to senior high schools were such that the survey did not query them. While interesting and worth further, systematic investigation and analysis, examination of these speculations is beyond the intent of this paper.

6. Problems

Reflective consideration of the program suggests that it is definitely valuable; however, a number of problems nip at the edges of the program. Actually, some of these problems probably risk taking sizeable bites out of the core of the program. The following problems are on the plate:

1. Dependency on students as van drivers.

2. Requests for transportation policy exceptions.

3. Cutting schools and/or individual teachers once they have been involved in the program.

4. Impact of the block structure on the university scheduling.

5. Communication among all departments involved in the Pre-Professional Block.

6. Continuous changes in the faculty and staff pool assigned to O&P.

7. Tendency to assign new faculty and staff to the Pre-Professional Block.

8. Program assessment procedures are fragmented, yet cooperatively implemented rather than collaboratively planned and triangulated for the entire Pre-Professional Block.

9. Apparent ineffectiveness of the current program among secondary majors assigned to senior high schools.

7. Possible Approaches to Solving Identified Problems

It would be wonderful if this final section could offer solutions; it does not. It only offers suggestions where all individuals involved in this collaborative program might look to carve out solutions. To the degree that these suggestions require increased financial support or faculty and staff time investment, they may have limited utility in these times of intensifying financial constraint. Nonetheless, the following suggestions may serve as an arena for productive thought by all concerned with the program:

1. Maintain regular consultation with the Advisory Board. Seek opportunities for the Milwaukee Public Schools members of the Advisory Board to have released time for meetings of the board on Tuesdays before the Milwaukee trips begin.

2. Support a coherent program assessment model by providing adequate released time for a cadre of faculty and staff to plan and implement the model.

3. Consult with representatives of the senior high schools to conceive some alternative programs and/or experiences that might be more effective with the university students assigned to these buildings.

4. Establish a faculty and staff assignment to the Pre-Professional Block rotation that maintains stability and fosters long term planning and program evolution.

5. Foster student transfer of meaning from campus classes to field site classrooms by providing adequate released time for all faculty and staff in the Pre-Professional Block to coordinate their efforts.

APPENDIX A

PI 4.10 Clinical programs.

(3)

(c) The SCD shall require that each student, under the supervision of professional school personnel, complete a pre-student teaching clinical program consisting of a minimum of 100 clock hours of experience working directly with children and youth within a school or other instructional setting.

(d) The SCD shall require during the prestudent teaching clinical program experience at least 2 written evaluations of each student based upon observations by the cooperating teacher or by the SCD supervisor.

(e) The institution shall ensure that at least one member of the SCD has assigned time to function as the designated administrator and coordinator of all prestudent teaching and clinical experiences.

PI 4.11 Human relations.

(8) The program shall require a minimum of 50 documented clock hours of direct involvement with adult and pupil members of a group whose background the student does not share, including at least one of the following designated ethnic minority groups: African-Americans, Alaskan-Americans, American Indians, foreign born persons of color; and with disabled persons; and with various socioeconomic groups, including low income. At least 25 of the 50 clock hours of direct involvement shall be with representatives of one or more of the designated ethnic minority groups. That part of the required 50 hours of direct involvement which is with pupils may be accommodated as a part of prestudent teaching, student teaching and other clinical experience requirements.

APPENDIX B

PRE-PROFESSIONAL BLOCK FIELD O & P EXPERIENCE DATA 1991-1992

FALL, 1991

Site	UW-W students	MPS Co-ops
Cooper	7	7
Dover Street	15	15
Fernwood	15	15
Forest Home	14	15
Humboldt Park	13	13
Lincoln	6	6
Mitchell	14	14
78th Street	9	9
67th Street	15	15
Zablocki	8	8
Audubon	26	26
Bell	9	9
Kosciuszko	17	17
Fritsche	26	26
Project STREAM	20	
Burroughs		
Muir		
Webster		
South Division	8	8
Pulaski	9	9
19 schools		
By school level:		
elementary	= 116	116
middle	= 78	78
	= 20 (STREAM)	
high	= 17	17

Total = 20+211= 231 Students 211 Co-ops

Note: 1.00 Co-ops per student

Transportation
7 UW-System vans
1 Rental van
2 half size buses
2 full size buses

Approx. total cost = $12,577
Approx. cost/stu = $54.44
Approx. cost/stu/trip = $6.81

SPRING, 1992

Sites	UW-W students	MPS Co-ops
Barton	9	12
Cooper	12	13
Fernwood	12	16
Forest Home	12	12
Humboldt Park	12	19
Lincoln	8	10
78th Street	13	15
67th Street	12	14
Zablocki	10	10
Audubon	10	13
Bell	7	7
Kosciuszko	21	23
Fritsche	21	25
Project STREAM	31	
Burroughs		
Muir		
Webster		
Hamilton	12	17
South Division	12	15
Pulaski	9	13
19 schools		
By school level:		
elementary	= 100	121
middle	= 59	68
	= 31 (STREAM)	
high	= 33	45

Total = 31+19 = 223 Students 234 Co-ops

Note: 1.22 Co-ops per student

Transportation
6 UW-System vans
4 full size buses

Approx. total cost = $11,468
Approx. cost/stu = $51.42
Approx. cost/stu/trip = $6.43

Total Approximate Costs for 1991-92

Number of students served= 454
Approximate total cost=$ 24,045
Cost per student=$ 52.96
Cost per student per trip=$ 6.62

PRE-PROFESSIONAL BLOCK FIELD O & P EXPERIENCE DATA 1992-1993

FALL, 1992

Site	UW-W students	MPS Co-ops
Barton	12	12
Bruce	10	10
Fernwood	9	9
Forest Home	12	12
Honey Creek	15	15
Humboldt Park	15	16
Irving	14	15
78th Street	13	14
Stuart	4	4
Audubon	15	15
Kosciuszko	19	19
Fritsche	11	11
Project STREAM	(33)	
Burroughs	12	
Muir	12	
Webster	9	
Hamilton	15	15
South Division	15	19
Pulaski	18	18

18 schools

By school level:

elementary	= 104	116
middle	= 45	78
	= 33 (STREAM)	
high	= 48	17

Total = 33+197= 230 Students 204 Co-ops

Note: 1.04 Co-ops per student

Transportation
7 UW-System vans
4 full size buses

Approx. total cost = $
Approx. cost/stu = $
Approx. cost/stu/trip = $

SPRING, 1993

Sites	UW-W students	MPS Co-ops
Barton	13	13
Forest Home	12	12
Honey Creek	15	15
Humboldt Park	13	13
Irving	13	13
78th Street	13	13
Audubon	9	9
Kosciuszko	19	19
Fritsche	16	16
Project STREAM	(29)	
Burroughs		
Muir		
Webster		
Hamilton	12	12
South Division	13	13
Pulaski	11	11

15 schools

By school level:

elementary	= 79
middle	= 44
	= 29 (STREAM)
high	= 36

Total = 29 +159= 188 Students 159 Co-ops

Note: 1.00 Co-ops per student

Transportation
5 UW-System vans
4 full size buses

Approx. total cost = $
Approx. cost/stu = $
Approx. cost/stu/trip = $

Total Approximate Costs for 1992-93

Number of students served	=	
Approximate total cost	=	$
Cost per student	=	$
Cost per student per trip	=	$

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Pre-Professional Block Field Experience Data
(Fall, 1991; Spring, 1992; Fall, 1992)
Student Placements by Site

	F91/O&P	F91/STR	S92/O&P	S92/STR	F92/O&P	F92/STR
Elementary Sites						
Barton	1	-	9	-	12	-
Bruce	-	-	-	-	12	-
Cooper	7	-	12	-	-	-
Dover Street	15	-	-	-	-	-
Fernwood	15	-	12	-	9	-
Forest Home	14	-	12	-	12	-
Honey Creek (67th St)	15	-	12	-	15	-
Humboldt Park	13	-	12	-	15	-
Irving	-	-	-	-	14	-
Lincoln	6	-	8	-	-	-
Mitchell St	14	-	-	-	-	-
78th St	9	-	13	-	13	-
Stuart	-	-	-	-	4	-
Zablocki	8	-	10	-	-	-
Middle School Sites						
Audubon	26	-	10	-	15	-
Bell	9	-	7	-	-	-
Kosciuszko	17	-	21	-	19	-
Fritsche	26	-	21	-	11	-
PROJECT STREAM	-	20	-	31		
Burroughs					-	12
Muir					-	12
Webster					-	9
High School						
Hamilton	-	-	12	-	15	-
South Division	8	-	12	-	15	-
Pulaski	9	-	9	-	18	-

	F91	%Total	S92	%Total	F92	%Total
TOTAL ELMENTARY	**117**	**50.4%**	**100**	**44.9%**	**104**	**45.2%**
TOTAL MID SCH	**98**	**42.2%**	**90**	**40.4%**	**78**	**33.9%**
TOTAL HIGH SCH	**17**	**7.3%**	**33**	**14.8%**	**48**	**20.9%**
GRAND TOTALS	**232**	**99.9%**	**223**	**100.1%**	**230**	

Pre-Professional Block Field Experience Data
(Spring, 1993; Fall, 1993; Spring, 1994)
Student Placements by Site

	S93/O&P	S93/STR	F93/O&P	F93/STR	S94/O&P	S94/STR
Elementary Sites						
Barton	13	-	-	-	-	-
Bruce	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cooper	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dover Street	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fernwood	-	-	-	-	-	-
Forest Home	12	-	-	-	-	-
Honey Creek	15	-	-	-	-	-
Humboldt Park	13	-	-	-	-	-
Irving	13	-	-	-	-	-
Lincoln	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mitchell St	-	-	-	-	-	-
78th St	13	-	-	-	-	-
Stuart	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zablocki	-	-		-	-	-
Middle School Sites						
Audubon	9	-	-	-	-	-
Bell	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kosciuszko	19	-	-	-	-	-
Fritsche	16	-	-	-	-	-
PROJECT STREAM	-	29	-	-		
Burroughs					-	-
Muir					-	-
Webster					-	-
High School						
Hamilton	12	-	-	-	-	-
South Division	13	-	-	-	-	-
Pulaski	11	-	-	-	-	-

	S93	%Total	F93	%Total	S94	%Total
TOTAL ELMENTARY	**79**	**42.0%**				
TOTAL MID SCH	**73**	**38.8%**				
TOTAL HIGH SCH	**36**	**19.1%**				
GRAND TOTALS	**188**	**99.9%**				

APPENDIX C

COOPERATING TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

Observation and Participation
439-210 and 489-210

Each item in this evaluation form should be assigned a value on a scale from 1 to 9. Each item includes descriptive statements to help make value judgements. In general a value of 1 suggests unsatisfactory or below average performance, while a value of 9 indicates that the student is outstanding in the category being evaluated. Please circle the appropriate value. You are encouraged to make comments in the final section of the form. These comments usually are the most meaningful part of this evaluation.

I RESPONSIBILITY AND INITIATIVE

Value	Description
1	Lacks motivation; lacks initiative; minimal interaction; relies on teacher for direction
2 to 5-	Demonstrates minimal motivation; demonstrates minimal initiative; some interaction; usually waits for teacher suggestions
5+ to 8	Shows considerable motivation and sense of purpose in being in the classroom; engages in frequent interactions; accepts responsibility and generally takes initiative; occasionally brings in ideas to try
9	Expresses high motivation and sense of purpose in being in the classroom; regularly engages in interactions; assumes responsibility; takes initiatives that coordinate well with the instructional program; checks resources, shows resourcefulness; frequently brings in ideas to try

1 2 3 4 5- 5+ 6 7 8 9

II COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS

Value	Description
1	Lacks facility in communicating with students and cooperating teacher
2 to 5-	Shows some facility in communicating with students and cooperating teacher
5+ to 8	Initiates and demonstrates appropriate interactions with students and cooperating teacher
9	Establishes and maintains strong rapport with students and cooperating teacher

1 2 3 4 5- 5+ 6 7 8 9

II RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS

Value	Description
1	Demonstrates a lack of understanding of students and their individual needs
2 to 5-	Shows some understanding of students' individual differences and needs; shows interest in students' ideas and feelings
5+ to 8	Demonstrates an acceptance of individual differences and needs; builds self-image of students with praise and encouragement
9	Reveals both sensitivity to and support of students' individuality; consistently utilizes opportunities to sustain positive self-image

1 2 3 4 5- 5+ 6 7 8 9

IV COMMENTS

Please comment on this student's strengths and weaknesses.

Signature of Student Date

Signature of Cooperating Teacher Date

Developed in conjunction with faculty and staff of Bell Middle School, Milwaukee, WI.